

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 27 are pending with claim 27 added by this paper.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges the allowance of claims 1 - 10 and 12 and the allowability of claims 11, 18 - 19, 21 - 22, and 25 - 26.

Claim Objections

Applicant has amended claims 11 and 20 to overcome these objections. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that these objections should be withdrawn. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C §102

Claims 13 - 17, 23 and 24 stand rejected as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,512,950 (Long). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Long fails to teach an adapter, much less an adapter for delivering molten glass for continuously producing a glass ribbon by a float forming process (relevant to claim 13). Rather, Long teaches a mold for receiving a certain quantity of molten glass (column 1, lines 50 - 61). This mold produces glass sheets directly to eliminate cutting operations and to improve over processes that entail cutting out glass sheets from a continuous ribbon of glass. See column 1, lines 25 - 50. Thus, Long teaches a mold, not an adapter.

The action alleges a pouring chute delivering molten glass from a furnace to a mold may pivot between two positions and periodically feed two parallel lines and molds. Thus, the action concludes that one glass furnace can feed more than one pouring chute alternatively, and thus feed several lines of molds. The action further concludes that the traveling mold of Long is effective as an adapter and can deliver an amount of glass from any furnace to any molten bath.


However, Long does not teach these assertions. Instead, Long discloses two processes, one that utilizes a ladle 18 to pour a fixed amount of glass into a mold, and a pouring chute 33 to

feed a fixed liquid glass volume or "gob" 32 into a mold. Thus, the mold receives molten glass. In both instances, the molten glass is allowed to plasticize before further processing in an annealing oven. (See columns 5 - 6, particularly column 5, lines 17 - 31 and column 5, lines 54 - 61). Long fails to teach an adapter for delivering an amount of molten glass from a plurality of glass melting furnaces each at a different location (relevant to claims 13 and 27). Failing to teach these features, Long cannot anticipate the claimed invention. If the Examiner maintains this rationale for rejecting the claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner point out specifically in Long where Long teaches that the mold can deliver an amount of molten glass from any furnace to any molten metal bath.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration is courteously requested. If there are any remaining issues which can be expedited by a telephone conference, the Examiner is courteously invited to telephone counsel at the number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,


James E. Ruland, Reg. No. 37,432
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: SGT-0053

Date: 21 March 2005

JER:jq
K:\Sgt\53\REPLY 3-3-05.doc